

Remarks

This is in response to the non-final Office Action mailed December 23, 2003. The abstract has been amended to remove legal phraseology and to reduce its length. Portions of the specification have been amended to address informalities. Claim 2 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8-10, 12, and 14-17 have been amended. Claim 19 has been added. Claims 1 and 3-19 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance are requested in view of the following remarks.

I. Preliminary Remarks Regarding Claim Amendments

Claim 2 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer as to its future prosecution, and amended claim 1 incorporates subject matter from canceled claim 2. In addition, claim 1 has been broadened to generically recite a "selection input" and a "properties input" without reference to a specific input device. Claim 1 has also been amended to recite selective reception of a selection input and selective reception of a properties input to clarify that both inputs need not be received at one time. Finally, claim 1 has been editorially amended to clarify that the control properties of the control object are applied to one or more selected items in response to the selection input.

Claims 3 and 6 have been editorially edited to address informalities, and claim 3 has been amended to be consistent with amended claim 1. Claim 5 has been amended to depend from claim 1 rather than canceled claim 2. All of the amendments to claims 3, 5, and 6 are to address typographical errors or other informalities; none of the amendments limit the scope of the claims.

Claim 8 has been amended to address informalities; none of the amendments limit the scope of the claim.

Claim 9 has been amended to incorporate subject matter from canceled claim 2, and to clarify that the control properties of the first control object are applied to one or more selected items in response to the selection mouse click.

Claims 10, 12, and 14-17 have been amended to address informalities; none of the amendments limit the scope of the claims.

New claim 19 has been added, which depends from claim 1 and specifically recites that the selection input and the properties input are both mouse clicks.

II. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6, 9, 10, 12, and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Angiulo et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,456,304. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration is requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim 1 is directed at a method for providing a user interface control to modify properties of items within a main application window. Claim 1 recites a control object having a selection portion and a properties portion with one or more controls.

Angiulo fails to disclose or suggest a control object having a selection portion and a properties portion with one or more controls, as recited by claim 1. Angiulo's dropdown menus 130, 136, and 146 of toolbar 100 do not function as, and are not equivalent to, a selection portion and a properties portion with one or more controls.

Angiulo further fails to disclose or suggest the following limitations of claim 1: (i) applying control properties of the control object to one or more selected items within the main application window in response to the selection input upon the selection portion of the control object; and (ii) modifying one or more control object properties in response to the properties input upon the properties portion of the control object.

For at least these reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claim 1, as well as claims 3-6 that depend therefrom, are respectfully requested.

Independent claims 9 and 15, although not identical in scope to claim 1, include limitations similar to those noted above with respect to claim 1. Consequently, reconsideration and allowance of claims 9 and 15, as well as claims 10, 12, 16, and 17 that depend respectively therefrom, are respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Angiulo in view of Wolf, U.S. Patent No. 5,838,321. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and the correctness of the rejection is not conceded.

However, it is respectfully noted that Angiulo is not a proper reference under section 103 because the present application (App. No. 09/896,384) and Angiulo (U.S. Patent No. 6,456,304) were, at the time the invention of the present application was made, owned by Microsoft Corporation. See 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) and MPEP 706.02(l).

Consequently, removal of Angiulo as prior art under section 103 and allowance of claims 7, 8, 13, 14, and 18 are respectfully requested.


IV. Conclusion

Favorable reconsideration in the form of a Notice of Allowance is requested. Please contact the undersigned attorney with any questions regarding this application.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: April 23, 2004



Robert A. Kalinsky
Reg. No. 50,471
RAK